U.S. Department of Education

2015 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

| | [X] Public or [] | Non-public | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| For Public Schools only: (Check all that app | ply) [] Title I | [] Charter | [] Magnet | [] Choice |
| Name of Principal Mrs. Rhonda Steinberg | | | | |
| (Specify: Ms., Miss, Months of Miss of Miss, Miss, Months of Miss of M | ntary School | c.) (As it should ap | pear in the official | records) |
| School Mailing Address 455 24th Street (If address | s is P.O. Box, al | so include street add | dress.) | |
| City Manhattan Beach | State <u>CA</u> | Zip Cod | e+4 (9 digits total | 1) 90266-4337 |
| County Los Angeles County | 5 | State School Code | Number* 19 75 | 6333 6020358 |
| Telephone <u>310-546-8022</u> | I | Fax <u>310-303-381</u> | 7 | |
| Web site/URL http://www.mbusd.org | I | E-mail <u>rsteinberg</u> | g@mbusd.org | |
| Twitter Handle Facebook Page | e | Google+ | | |
| YouTube/URL Blog | | Other Soc | cial Media Link _ | |
| I have reviewed the information in this as Eligibility Certification), and certify that i | | uding the eligibil | ity requirements | on page 2 (Part I- |
| | | Date | | |
| (Principal's Signature) | | | | |
| Name of Superintendent* <u>Dr. Michael Ma</u> (Specify: Ms., 1) Other) | | Mr | il: mmatthews@1 | mbusd.org |
| District Name Manhattan Beach Unified St. I have reviewed the information in this as Eligibility Certification), and certify that is | pplication, incl | | | on page 2 (Part I- |
| (Superintendent's Signature) | | _Date | | |
| Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mr. William Fourn (Specify: | nell Ms., Miss, Mi | rs., Dr., Mr., Othe | r) | |
| I have reviewed the information in this a Eligibility Certification), and certify that i | | uding the eligibil | ity requirements | on page 2 (Part I- |
| (6.1.15.15.15.15.15.15.15.15.15.15.15.15.1 | | Date | | |
| (School Board President's/Chairperson's | Signature) | | | |

*Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school's application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below, concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education and National Blue Ribbon Schools requirements, are true and correct.

- 1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
- 3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state's AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2014-2015 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
- 4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.
- 5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2009 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
- 6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014.
- 7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
- 8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 2 of 28

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

| 1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation): | 5 Elementary schools (includes K-81 Middle/Junior high schools | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | 1 High schools 0 K-12 schools | | | |

7 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

| 2. | Category | that | best | describes | the area | where | the | school | is | located: |
|----|----------|------|------|-----------|----------|-------|-----|--------|----|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| [] Urban or large central city |
|---|
| [] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area |
| [X] Suburban |
| [] Small city or town in a rural area |
| [] Rural |

- 3. 10 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
- 4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|
| | Males | | |
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 61 | 60 | 121 |
| 1 | 64 | 56 | 120 |
| 2 | 67 | 53 | 120 |
| 3 | 60 | 60 | 120 |
| 4 | 75 | 65 | 140 |
| 5 | 56 | 57 | 113 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Students | 383 | 351 | 734 |

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 3 of 28

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

- 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
- 9 % Asian
- 2 % Black or African American
- 0 % Hispanic or Latino
- 2 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- 86 % White
- 0 % Two or more races

100 % Total

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2013 - 2014 year: 1%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

| Steps For Determining Mobility Rate | Answer |
|--|--------|
| (1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> | |
| the school after October 1, 2013 until the | 10 |
| end of the school year | |
| (2) Number of students who transferred | |
| <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2013 until | 1 |
| the end of the school year | |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of | 11 |
| rows (1) and (2)] | 11 |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as | 735 |
| of October 1 | 133 |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) | 0.015 |
| divided by total students in row (4) | 0.015 |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 1 |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 2 %

13 Total number ELL

Number of non-English languages represented: 8

Specify non-English languages: <u>French, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Spanish,</u> Vietnamese

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 1%

Total number students who qualify: $\frac{4}{}$

Information for Public Schools Only - Data Provided by the State

The state has reported that 7 % of the students enrolled in this school are from low income or disadvantaged families based on the following subgroup(s): Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 4 of 28

9. Students receiving special education services: $\frac{10}{71}$ % $\frac{10}{10}$ Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

8 Autism0 Orthopedic Impairment0 Deafness10 Other Health Impaired0 Deaf-Blindness20 Specific Learning Disability0 Emotional Disturbance28 Speech or Language Impairment3 Hearing Impairment0 Traumatic Brain Injury

<u>1</u> Mental Retardation <u>1</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness

<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

| | Number of Staff |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Administrators | 1 |
| Classroom teachers | 30 |
| Resource teachers/specialists | |
| e.g., reading, math, science, special | 8 |
| education, enrichment, technology, | 0 |
| art, music, physical education, etc. | |
| Paraprofessionals | 19 |
| Student support personnel | |
| e.g., guidance counselors, behavior | |
| interventionists, mental/physical | |
| health service providers, | 2 |
| psychologists, family engagement | 2 |
| liaisons, career/college attainment | |
| coaches, etc. | |
| | |

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 24:1

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 5 of 28

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

| Required Information | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 97% | 98% | 98% | 97% | 96% |
| High school graduation rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

13. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2014

| Post-Secondary Status | |
|---|----|
| Graduating class size | 0 |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | 0% |
| Enrolled in a community college | 0% |
| Enrolled in career/technical training program | 0% |
| Found employment | 0% |
| Joined the military or other public service | 0% |
| Other | 0% |

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award. Yes No X

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

15. Please summarize your school mission in 25 words or less: Grand View's vision is to create a stimulating, innovative, enjoyable and supportive environment to meet the academic, social and emotional needs of all children.

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 6 of 28

PART III – SUMMARY

Grand View Elementary School is one of five elementary schools in the Manhattan Beach Unified School District. Our school was built by the United States Works Progress Administration (WPA) in 1939 and we proudly celebrated our 75th anniversary last year. Grand View (GV) is nestled on a hill in a densely populated section of Manhattan Beach, where yards are minimal and children play together on the street. We are an old fashioned community school in which 95% of the students live within a half mile of campus, with most riding bikes or walking to school. This area attracts parents who prioritize sending their children to strong community public schools. GV parents and students are acutely aware of how safe, nurturing, and truly special their school is, and with this appreciation comes a sense of responsibility to contribute to the school community in a meaningful way. Our student body includes 734 students in grades transitional kindergarten (TK) through fifth. In addition to 30 classrooms, there is a reading intervention classroom, resource room, library, science lab, computer lab, music room, performing arts center and a room dedicated to makerspace. We also house three classrooms for our popular afterschool Extended Day Program (EDP).

Grand View Elementary School earned national recognition as one of the first-ever U.S. Department of Education Green Ribbon Schools. We received this honor in 2012 in recognition of our innovative efforts to reduce our school's carbon footprint. We have instituted the Grades of Green program which has reduced our trash by 80%. We have gone from 40 large bags of trash during our daily lunch periods to only two! We recognize that incorporating environmental education in core subjects provides students with a meaningful context for adopting and maintaining a healthy lifestyle. Grand View "Gators" are committed to protecting our environment and making a difference for our planet.

This year, Grand View implemented an innovative makerspace program that provides hands-on, creative ways to encourage students to design, experiment, build, invent, and learn as they deeply engage in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) principles. Makerspace offers our students opportunities to investigate and tinker in a collaborative environment that encourages open-ended creativity and problem solving. The Gator Maker's motto is "Believe! If you can imagine it, you can make it." We hope to create a community of creative thinkers who assist one another. The focus is hands-on learning and innovation through participation.

Our Gator community has a tradition of consistent academic growth and continually strives to exceed expectations. GV earned the California Distinguished School Recognition in 1995, 2010 and 2014. Our challenging Common Core State standards based curriculum is the school's educational foundation. Through 2013, California public schools earned an Academic Performance Index (API) score from 200 (low) to 1000 (high) based primarily on student achievement in English language arts and mathematics. GV's API scores of 930, 955, 957, 970 and 966 provide quantitative validation of the school's high level of academic achievement. This steady success has transformed our entire school community to expect an excellent academic foundation for all students.

Grand View classroom teachers are exceptional and wholeheartedly embrace the school's culture of community and innovation. Most GV teachers possess master's degrees and all teachers participate in professional development. Ninety percent of our teachers have become certified in gifted and talented education strategies. In the last two years, all teachers have received professional development on implementing the Common Core Standards, Columbia Teachers College Reading and Writing Workshop, and Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) in mathematics. Grade level collaboration including focus group learning and site visits to other schools occurs regularly and is a crucial component of GV's teaching success. Academic issues are identified and addressed in formally set weekly meetings and in teachers' daily interactions. As a collaborative team, we focus on successful instruction to ensure the growth and achievement of each child.

Grand View could not provide our exceptional programs without the sustained commitment and support of the Manhattan Beach Education Foundation (MBEF) and the commitment of our PTA. These groups provide funding for many of GV's most valued programs and their supporting staff, such as the librarian, P.E. instructor, science specialist, and music teachers. GV has a long history as a leader in arts instruction.

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 7 of 28

The Young at Art program uses parent docents who receive professional training and then present lessons to classes on a particular artist and style. Materials are provided to the students so they can emulate the artist's technique while integrating their personal creativity into the project. Additionally, the Grand View afterschool enrichment program provides a variety of activities including the incredibly popular Sound Arts theatre program, chess, coding class, creative writing, and sports instruction courses.

We believe there are significant reasons that Grand View deserves national recognition as a Blue Ribbon School. The most compelling are Grand View's exceptional teachers, our outstanding academic achievement, our National Green Ribbon Award, our multiple California Distinguished School awards and our innovative, newly created makerspace. The Grand View community is never complacent. Administrators, teachers, parents, students, and local businesses in our tight-knit community continually strive to not only meet, but exceed, the academic, social and emotional needs of all students. Grand View Gators are known for going the extra mile in everything they do!

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 8 of 28

PART IV - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Core Curriculum:

Grand View continually strives to exceed expectations. We believe in implementing evidence-based instructional strategies that facilitate student mastery of the academic content standards and 21st century skills. Our curricular foundation has been the California Content Standards, but we are systematically transitioning to the Common Core State Standards by supplementing existing State adopted texts and using best practices to meet Common Core expectations.

Grand View follows district-adopted core curricula and has also found a myriad of innovative ways to enhance the reading curriculum through depth, rigor, and integration. The shifts in Common Core are central to all aspects of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Teachers utilize the research-based approach of balanced literacy to move students from learning to read to reading to learn. Students become critical consumers of information and learn to synthesize ideas from multiple sources. Teachers challenge students to provide evidence of thinking while incorporating meaningful, complex narrative and non-fiction texts throughout the curriculum. For example, students lead grand conversations on current events through Scholastic News, teachers raise the level of text complexity in shared reading experiences, and students push their thinking by considering opposing viewpoints. Using the Reading and Writing Workshop model, teachers meet the needs of all learners through small group instruction and by conferring with students individually, moving each one along his/her own continuum of learning. In addition, at-risk students are supported in small groups and individually by a reading specialist. Through this balanced approach of authentic literacy, students become accomplished readers.

Our writing curriculum is driven by both the new Common Core Standards and research-based principles of instruction, learning and assessment. Writing Workshop has been implemented in every classroom. The fundamental concept is that writing is a lifelong process in which we continually grow as writers. The curriculum consists of grade specific Common Core aligned Units of Study. Lessons follow a consistent structure with a focus on demonstration, scaffolding, and then allowing students ample time to write independently. During this writing time, teachers confer with small groups and individual students to address specific needs. Grand View believes that students need to be immersed in opportunities to write across the curriculum and teachers need to demonstrate how writing is constructed and applied. This commitment provides a rich mix of core and supplemental instructional methodologies and curricular materials that create a deep and flexible approach for reaching all students.

Math curriculum at Grand View is driven by Common Core mathematical practices and the daily needs of our individual students. We use Saxon Math as our core curriculum and with the advent of Common Core State Standards, each grade level has worked diligently to supplement the curriculum with relevant and rigorous lessons and embedded problem-solving. These lessons provide students with a greater understanding of mathematical practices with real world applications. Teachers integrate math manipulatives and technology applications to differentiate instruction and individualize learning. Professional development in Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) has helped engage teachers to consider the development of a child's mathematical thinking while building upon his/her prior knowledge and exploring frameworks for problem solving. Additionally, teachers have visited neighboring districts to observe CGI in action. These supplemental strategies are central to the implementation of Common Core Standards in mathematical understanding.

At Grand View, we believe that students learn science best by "doing" science; that is, hands-on application of concepts greatly increases student engagement and understanding. Our science education includes the essential skills and knowledge identified by the California State Content Standards and the new Next Generation Science Standards. In Grand View's science lab, students use technology and participate in highly engaging activities that extend and add depth to the science learning of their regular classroom. Science lab activities are designed to foster depth of understanding and increase students' curiosity. In addition, students learn laboratory skills such as measuring and recording data, analyzing data, and experimental design. Students develop the academic language of science through the practice of using

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 9 of 28

evidence collected from their experiments to defend their conclusions. These interactive opportunities foster students' love of learning and create a sense of wonder about the world around them. Our science scores continue to shine with 95% of our fifth grade students scoring at or above the proficiency level on the most recent standardized testing.

California State Standards also guide our social science and history curriculum for Grand View. Our teachers go beyond the textbook to support learning with a variety of leveled complex texts that provide access to the social studies curriculum for all students. Classroom libraries include grade level content historical fiction, interactive read-alouds, novel studies, Scholastic News, and replicas of primary documents and photographs of the time period. Technological devices are used to support research. All teachers apply Depth and Complexity prompts to encourage students to delve deeply into the details, patterns, trends and impacts of the social science curriculum. Grade levels participate in living history experiences including "Walk Through California," "Walk Through American Revolution," "Museum on Wheels," and "Rancho Days." Students attend field trips or enjoy guest speakers that help bring history alive. Thus, students are able to immerse themselves in their heritage and better appreciate the numerous ways that people and events from the past have influenced our world today.

2. Other Curriculum Areas:

At Grand View, we believe the arts are fundamental to a well-rounded education for all students. As such, two curriculum-driven art education programs are in place for all students: our artist-in-residency program and Young at Art. Each artist-in-residency is comprised of 10 performing arts classes, unique to each grade, and tied to a unit of study. For example, pantomime in kindergarten is tied to sequencing in math and writing, while square dance in third grade is tied to westward expansion as well as geometry and patterns. Lessons are taught by a professional artist, culminating in a collaborative teacher-artist partnership. The result is a program that meets VAPA and academic standards, advances school and district goals of nurturing an appreciation of the arts, a love of learning, and inspiring creativity, and engages students, teachers, and parents in standards-driven, grade-level content.

In a society where increasing competitive pressures are placed on our youth, Grand View believes it is important to embrace projects where the emphasis is on the process instead of the product. Grand View's innovative Young at Art (YAA) program provides our students with hands-on visual art education. Artists train parent docents, who then teach novel K-5 art lessons six times per year, ranging from primitive painting to 21st century abstract 3-D sculpture. Art history and other Social Studies curriculum standards are incorporated into these lessons. What matters during a YAA lesson is that each child creates art from the heart, gains confidence in the process of creating and problem solving, and that student choice is honored through unique individual expression.

Grand View offers students an incredible opportunity to participate in weekly music instruction. In Grand View's choral program, students are guided through activities designed to improve their music skills through learning to read the pitches, rhythms, and score markings in their music. Emphasizing the five areas of vocal technique: posture, breath control, diction, expression, resonant tone, and vocal health, students' confidence and musical expression develop through standards-based education.

Children in grades three through five are offered instrumental instruction in both band and strings, as part of their standards based education. Playing an instrument requires a significant amount of hard work, focus, and dedication. A majority of our students participate in musical opportunities in middle school, high school, and even college.

Grand View's after-school enrichment program, Sound Arts, embraces the philosophy of giving every child the opportunity to experience music and performance. The Sound Arts' motto is "Team Work Makes the Dream Work." Each semester culminates in the production of a musical which is specifically designed around the National Standards for Arts Education and the California State Standards. Students sing, act, and dance while learning about science, history, art, and cultural events. Sound Arts supports poise and confidence in young performers.

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 10 of 28

Grand View supports the California standards for physical education (PE) by employing a full time PE specialist who conducts classes for our first through fifth grade students. Each student receives 100 minutes of curriculum providing developmentally appropriate, skills based, physical activities. Students learn the importance of lifelong fitness and are exposed to a variety of individual and group activities.

Technology at Grand View has proven to be an important component of how GV students acquire skills and knowledge and work collaboratively across the curriculum. All students benefit from the dynamic nature of interactive whiteboards and document cameras in every classroom. The students are exposed to a range of content that brings lessons to life. Student focus and active participation ensures retention of knowledge. Third through fifth graders have 1:1 access to iPads and students benefit from the opportunity to use technology frequently. Teachers collaborate with District technology teachers on special assignment (TOSAs) to research and employ appropriate apps. They also develop lessons and activities that increase student technology skills, student engagement and student investment in content. First and second grade students use shared iPads for eReading leveled-texts and for writing and illustrating using apps such as My Story and Doodle Buddy.

Students regularly publish digital assignments using the tools in the computer lab. To begin laying a foundation for success in 21st-century career paths, every student uses iPads or desktop computers to participate in an Hour of Code. They learn about computer science as another means to enhance problemsolving skills, logic, and creativity. Grand View commends our teachers for having embraced the use of technology, challenging students to create content-not just be content consumers.

3. Instructional Methods and Interventions:

Grand View educators are committed to meeting the diverse academic needs of each student. Our teachers meet weekly to develop varied lessons that advance specific groups of students and employ research-driven, evidence-based strategies to ensure that all children have access to the core curriculum. Moreover, multiple opportunities for differentiation are built into the instructional day. Our students receive whole group, small group, and individual instruction designed to move all children forward in their learning.

Differentiation occurs daily across the curriculum. In Reading and Writing Workshop, teachers differentiate with individual student conferencing, where students receive instant and constructive feedback and teachers monitor students' progress daily. For more challenging lessons, teachers often use small group instruction, which allows students to support and enrich each other's work on an assignment. Finally, our teachers differentiate through use of individualized expectations of growth based on frequent, formative assessments. Our teachers can then effectively modify lessons—for example, by including more or less sophisticated numbers in a Cognitively Guided Instruction math word problem—in order to teach problem solving strategies and formatively move each student forward.

Grand View affords students requiring special education full and inclusive access to the core curriculum along with the necessary support to meet and surpass their academic goals. Special education specialists closely collaborate with general education teachers to support students with disabilities, help identify opportunities for lesson accommodations or differentiation, and pull out of and push in to the classroom to provide concentrated and effective individual and small group instruction. A full-time reading intervention teacher supports our "at risk" students. She works with students before, during, and after school. Two of her intervention programs are technology based – Lexile and Read Live. Parent training is embedded so that parents can use these web-based programs at home to provide additional support.

The incorporation of adaptive technology in each Grand View classroom provides our teachers with further opportunities for differentiation into daily instruction. Technology supports our students with special needs by offering accommodations to create speech-to-text writing, practice skills with learning apps, and listen to audio books, creating endless opportunities to ensure all students are able to access core curriculum.

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 11 of 28

PART V – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results Narrative Summary:

Grand View students consistently excel on measures of academic achievement. Prior to May 2014, the California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program (STAR) was administered annually to all second through fifth grade students at Grand View. This program consisted primarily of California Standards Tests (CST) for English/Language Arts (ELA) and Math. CST Science is given only in fifth grade. Student results are categorized into four levels of achievement: advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic. In fourth grade, the STAR California Writing Standards Test (a writing application test) was administered up until 2013.

Based on these assessment results, the Academic Performance Index (API) was calculated for each school and was widely used to compare schools throughout California. This index ranges from 200 (low) to 1,000 (high). From 2009 through 2013, our data shows consistent high achievement. Over these five years, Grand View's API scores have ranged from 930 to 970. California ranks us as a top performing school. The percentage of students achieving at the proficient/advanced levels in ELA ranged from 91% to 93% and in math from 92% to 96%.

Grand View uses test scores to inform instruction, analyze student data, review trends and measure growth over time. One trend indicated that the percentage of special education students achieving at a proficient/advanced level was significantly lower than all students. We quickly addressed this achievement gap. By revamping our reading intervention program and aligning it with the state's Response to Instruction and Intervention program (RTI2), we were able to make significant progress in closing the gap. At the first RTI2 tier, classroom teachers differentiate for the varied learning styles and academic needs of their students. The second tier includes additional instruction from the reading intervention teacher in both pushin and pull-out models, depending on the needs of the students and the teachers. For students needing more intense instruction, the third tier includes before/after school classes. Students who consistently struggle to achieve proficiency are then reviewed for possible special education intervention.

2. Assessment for Instruction and Learning and Sharing Assessment Results:

At Grand View, we believe strongly in analyzing multiple measures frequently to determine each student's academic strengths and challenges. School wide test data can mask individual students who are not meeting proficiency. With a focus on supporting each student to achieve proficiency in English language arts and mathematics, Grand View teachers analyze a variety of assessment data. The beginning of the year includes the analysis of state and district spring assessments and the administration and analysis of district required benchmark data. In addition, teachers administer and analyze formative assessments to inform instruction and set goals for student learning. Assessment is an integral part of the instructional decision making process.

Grand View implements Columbia University Teachers College Reading and Writing Workshop model as a cornerstone of its Balanced Literacy philosophy. Formative instruction is also used to assess learning and give teachers immediate, critical information to evaluate the teaching-learning process. Teachers collaborate weekly and share student data with their grade level peers to ensure that each child is reaching his or her potential and has a firm grasp of grade level content standards. After each Unit of Study, teachers evaluate student growth and achievement and adjust their pedagogy accordingly.

This year, all teachers participated in professional development on the implementation of the Fountas and Pinnell (F & P) reading assessment system. Classroom teachers employ the F & P, additional reading comprehension assessments, and monitor student progress through their balanced literacy instruction and reading/writing conferencing. The reading intervention teacher provides analysis of student progress through the computer programs Read Naturally and LexiaCore5.

Grand View teachers supplement Saxon Math assessments with teacher and computer generated tests to

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 12 of 28

align with the Common Core State Standards in mathematics and provide opportunities for students to demonstrate mathematical problem solving abilities and depth of knowledge. With the transition to Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) in mathematics, innovative practices have yielded impressive outcomes for students, including increased student perseverance.

Student academic achievement is continually shared with parents. Ongoing communication takes place through formal report cards, the PowerSchool student information system, and parent conferencing. Email and telephone conferences are also used regularly. In the upper grades, progress reports are sent home every six weeks, keeping students and parents aware of achievement.

Grand View understands that a primary key to student success is a strong home-school connection. We work diligently with electronic and personal communication to ensure constant communication throughout the year.

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 13 of 28

1. School Climate/Culture

As you walk onto the Grand View campus, you immediately find a welcoming environment filled with colorful murals, artifacts of student success and a strong sense of community. Walk toward the garden and you will find large chalkboards with positive messages written from student to student. Peek into the staff room and you will see a bulletin board where staff members have left each other messages of gratitude. There is a special camaraderie among students, teachers, parents, support staff, and the principal that permeates the school. You feel the welcoming small-town Manhattan Beach spirit in our school.

Grand View is a community where everyone is working together, as a team. Each staff member is committed to recognizing and addressing the unique qualities of each student. The staff differentiates and accommodates to address each child's academic, social, and emotional needs. The administration encourages each teacher to share ideas and programs that support this vision. Our school counselor meets with individuals and groups to support children's behavioral and emotional needs. Together, we are committed to growing the whole child.

Developing good character is the result of a conscientious effort to instill and reinforce ethical values. Grand View has adopted the "Character Counts" program. Recognition and awards are given to students who demonstrate the following positive character traits: trustworthiness, fairness, respect, responsibility, caring and citizenship. The Mind Up program has been adopted to teach children techniques to manage stress, be more in touch with their feelings, and to understand how their brains work. Grand View is committed to a "mindful" education for each child that includes life skills, academic accomplishment, and the necessary tools to establish lifelong social and emotional health.

Fifth grade students have the opportunity to participate in a before school Creativity Class. Children collaborate to create, record, and publish an original song. Each child's suggestions are incorporated into the song with the belief that "Every Idea is a Good Idea." The class encourages students to believe in themselves. Students learn "If you can dream it, you can achieve it."

The school culture motivates the students, as well as the staff, to learn, collaborate, and grow. Grand View staff feels valued and supported by a community of parents who are actively involved, a School Board and Superintendent who consistently celebrate their successes, and parent organizations that provide materials and funding to show their ongoing home-school support. Grand View feels like home because we consider ourselves a family.

2. Engaging Families and Community

Grand View harnesses the incredible talent and contributions of our parents and community partners to enrich each child's educational experience at our school. Parents, businesses, universities, professionals, and other residents provide vital volunteer time, financial support, and event sponsorship and attendance.

Grand View fosters a collaborative culture through which parents are encouraged to share their time and expertise. Parents logged over 33,000 volunteer hours last year assisting teachers in the classrooms, library, and science lab; administering our art program; working with teachers to identify and organize curriculumtied and PTA-funded field trips and performing arts programs for every grade; writing grants; designing and implementing new programs like Run Club and makerspace; sharing insight into their varied professions; serving on event committees and in PTA leadership positions; engaging local businesses; and conducting community outreach.

Financially, 98% of Grand View families engage through the PTA and 87% contribute to the Manhattan Beach Education Foundation (MBEF). California funds less per student than almost every other state in the nation, and Manhattan Beach Unified School District falls in the bottom 25% of state disbursement per student. The PTA pays for supplies, field trips and supplemental programs. MBEF fills some of the gaps

NBRS 2015 15CA464PU Page 14 of 28

by funding our librarian; specialists in science, reading, PE and music; and 1 out of every 5 teachers, which keeps class sizes down. In support of all Manhattan Beach schools, Grand View hosts a citywide 5K "Gator Run," now in its 20th year, to benefit MBEF.

Grand View also engages the broader community through events and in the classrooms. In addition to the Gator Run, we emphasize community building events like Family Movie Night, Pancake Breakfast, Book Fair, Spring Fair and our Parent Party Auction. All events are published in weekly emails, on our school website, and on Facebook. Local restaurants and grocery stores donate or discount food, and our sponsoring neighborhood bookstore gives a portion of book fair proceeds back to our school. Local artists develop art projects for the classroom and Rotary Club members read to students in the library, where authors and illustrators talk about their crafts. UCLA and Children's Hospital LA lend experts to the Science Expo. Adults are not the only community volunteers - high school students operate fair booths, and entire families improve the school grounds on Pride Day.

Grand View believes in the motto, "Enter to learn. Go forth to serve." We strive to teach our students the importance of contributing to the greater community and helping others who are less fortunate. We proudly partner with HOLA's Adopt-a-Family program, LA Food Bank, Harbor Interfaith and Access Books, through which we recently donated 2,000 books to a neighboring low-income school. Clothing and sports equipment drives benefit underprivileged schools and families. Through our community engagement, our children learn how to make the world a better place.

3. Professional Development

As Thomas Guskey (2000) states, "One constant finding in the research literature is that notable improvements in education almost never take place in the absence of professional development." Grand View Elementary is fortunate to reside within the Manhattan Beach Unified School District which provides a multi-layered approach to professional development. These layers include: 1) district level; 2) site level; 3) grade level; and 4) individual teacher level. The emphasis over the past three years has been on implementing the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts through a Balanced Literacy framework.

The first phase of implementation was in the area of Columbia University Teachers College Writing Workshop, a methodology with over three decades of research supporting effectiveness. Teachers attended a multi-day workshop facilitated by Columbia Teacher's College followed by three years of ongoing support through local staff developers and teacher leaders, including three from Grand View.

This school year Grand View (GV) initiated the second phase where teachers were given an overview of other components of Balanced Literacy and how one can meet the demands of the Common Core through these various structures. After two days of workshops, teachers from each site self-selected one component of Balanced Literacy to form a "Focus Group" consisting of across grade level teams studying and learning about their selected area of Balanced Literacy. GV has the following Focus Groups: Shared Reading, Interactive Read Aloud, Small Group, and Word Work. Focus Groups are led by teacher leaders who have received further professional development in adult learning, coaching, and eliciting teacher reflection. Each Focus Group has spent three half-days and two staff meetings examining their selected component through the lens of a specific goal. Resources generated from these groups were shared with the entire Grand View staff.

The third phase came in two parts: 1) implementing the Fountas and Pinnell Reading Assessment K-5; and 2) adopting Columbia University Teachers College Reading Workshop as the MBUSD reading curriculum. Reading Workshop professional development began in the spring of 2015 with structured observations in a neighboring district coupled with curriculum mapping and will be followed by full day workshops, coaching, and lesson study.

To address the Common Core Mathematics Shifts, MBUSD has been moving toward changes in pedagogy and instructional materials. MBUSD has formed a strong partnership with UCLA Center X's Mathematics

Project. Through this partnership, Grand View teachers have participated in two full-day workshops. The proposed three-year plan includes workshops, coaching, and lesson study.

Grand View's principal actively participates in district committees and principal professional development on the Common Core, coaching, and Collaborative Inquiry Visits, where principals host focused schoolwide observations and provide each other with targeted feedback on strengths and potential next steps.

Finally, Grand View teachers participate in the many leadership opportunities at their site and throughout the district such as: curriculum mapping, reading committee, math committee, writing leadership, and hosting demonstration lessons for MBUSD colleagues. Grand View teachers are MBUSD leaders who believe in lifelong learning and are an essential component to building capacity throughout all elementary schools.

4. School Leadership

The Grand View principal recognizes the unique talents and strengths of teachers, support staff, parents and community members and fosters an atmosphere of trust among all stakeholders. The formal leadership team is comprised of the principal, one teacher from each grade level, and a special education representative. This Leadership team meets monthly to support the principal with school management and the problem solving needs of their colleagues.

Grand View teachers are recognized as leaders in our school district. Two teachers serve as the Grade Level leads for the district and sixteen others serve on district curriculum committees. An active and approachable School Board, a visionary Superintendent, and hands-on Directors at the district help to guide Manhattan Beach Unified School District's vision of preparing our students to become good citizens and leaders in our complex and rapidly changing world.

The leadership philosophy of Grand View is epitomized in the belief that each student's success is dependent upon the support of the entire school community. All stakeholders work in concert to realize the collective vision of providing an educational environment where all children are encouraged to be "the best that they can be." Shared leadership and an administrative open-door policy are reflected in the common focus and commitment of teachers, support staff, parents, and students.

School Site Council (SSC) is an elected leadership group and with guidance from the principal, this council of parents and teachers analyzes school-wide assessment data, establishes achievement goals, and determines the specific actions necessary to meet student needs in our Single Plan for Student Achievement. Our staff works closely with our PTA and Education Foundation, which provide essential funding to increase our instructional resources. Our PTA leaders, teachers, and principal develop an annual budget aligned with school goals for student achievement. PTA provides financial support for iPads, laptops, interactive whiteboards, site licenses for computer resources, and many materials used in classrooms on a daily basis.

Student Council assumes leadership roles by facilitating our Recycling Club, Spirit Club, Garden Club, Fun Fridays, Grades of Green, and Community Service projects. They have helped collect warm coats, sports equipment for less fortunate schools, books for needy libraries, clothing, and used cell phones.

Collaboration and team spirit play a critical leadership role in the overall success of Grand View's reputation as a dynamic and vibrant learning community. As John Wooden once famously said, "It is amazing how much can be accomplished if no one cares who gets the credit."

| Subject: Math | Test: <u>CST</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 3 | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 91 | 96 | 88 | 95 | 91 |
| Advanced | 69 | 80 | 64 | 78 | 75 |
| Number of students tested | 116 | 116 | 153 | 109 | 117 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 98 | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with | | | | | |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with | 0 | | | | 0 |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price | | | | | |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/ | | | | | |
| Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special | | | | | |
| Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | 69 | 69 | 67 | |
| Advanced | _ | 0 | 0 | 44 | |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 10 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 7. American Indian or | | | | | |
| Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 94 | 98 | 88 | 96 | 90 |
| Advanced | 71 | 85 | 62 | 80 | 72 |
| Number of students tested | 83 | 85 | 116 | 80 | 102 |
| 10. Two or More Races | | | | | |
| identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Filipino | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California used Smarter Balance Testing in 2013 - 2014 therefore the data tables are off by one year.

Blank boxes indicates data were not made public because fewer than 11 students were tested.

| Subject: Math | Test: <u>CST</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 4 | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | 1 | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 93 | 95 | 93 | 92 |
| Advanced | 85 | 72 | 80 | 74 | 71 |
| Number of students tested | 119 | 149 | 112 | 116 | 119 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with | 100 | 100 | 77 | 100 | 100 |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| alternative assessment | | | | 1 | 1 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price | | | | | |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/ | | | | | |
| Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special | | | | | |
| Education Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | 71 | | | 83 |
| Advanced | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 14 | 8 | 10 | 12 |
| 3. English Language Learner | 3 | 1. | | 10 | 12 |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of students tested | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | 1 | | |
| Advanced | | | † | 1 | † |
| Number of students tested | | | 1 | 1 | |
| 7. American Indian or | | | | | |
| Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | 1 | 1 | |
| 1 IG TUILOOG | <u> </u> | 1 | 1 | 1 | Page 19 of 28 |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 95 | 94 | 94 | 92 |
| Advanced | 84 | 66 | 79 | 74 | 74 |
| Number of students tested | 83 | 113 | 84 | 83 | 102 |
| 10. Two or More Races | | | | | |
| identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Filipino | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California used Smarter Balance Testing in 2013 -2014 therefore the data tables are off by one year.

Bland boxes indicates data were not made public because fewer than 11 students were tested.

| Subject: Math | Test: <u>CST</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 5 | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | 1 |
| Proficient and above | 94 | 95 | 96 | 92 | 94 |
| Advanced | 66 | 76 | 80 | 70 | 63 |
| Number of students tested | 153 | 109 | 111 | 118 | 98 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 99 | 98 | 99 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with | | | | | |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price | | | | | |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/ | | | | | |
| Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special | | | | | |
| Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 |
| 3. English Language Learner | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | + | | | |
| Advanced | | <u> </u> | | + | |
| Number of students tested | | | | - | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | 1 | | | |
| Advanced | | <u> </u> | | + | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | 1 | | | |
| Advanced Number of students tested | | + | | + | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | + | | + | + |
| Number of students tested | | 1 | + | + | |
| 7. American Indian or | | | | | |
| Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | 1 | | + | |
| Auvanceu | | 1 | | | Page 21 of 28 |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 94 | 93 | 98 | 92 | 94 |
| Advanced | 66 | 73 | 85 | 73 | 61 |
| Number of students tested | 117 | 77 | 79 | 89 | 88 |
| 10. Two or More Races | | | | | |
| identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Filipino | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California used Smarter Balance Testing in 2013 - 2014 therefore the data tables are off by one year.

Blank boxes indicates data were not made public because fewer than 11 students were tested.

| Subject: Reading/ELA | Test: <u>CST</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 3 | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 86 | 86 | 79 | 84 | 85 |
| Advanced | 43 | 49 | 38 | 49 | 48 |
| Number of students tested | 116 | 117 | 152 | 109 | 116 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 99 | 99 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with | | | | | |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price | | | | | |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/ | | | | | |
| Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special | | | | | |
| Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | 62 | 46 | 50 | 67 |
| Advanced | | 0 | 23 | 30 | 33 |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 9 |
| 3. English Language Learner | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | 1 | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or | | | | | |
| Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | 1 | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 87 | 87 | 80 | 83 | 85 |
| Advanced | 44 | 43 | 36 | 46 | 50 |
| Number of students tested | 87 | 86 | 116 | 80 | 101 |
| 10. Two or More Races | | | | | |
| identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Filipino | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California used Smarter Balance Testing in 2013 - 2014 therefore the data tables are off by one year.

Blank boxes indicates data were not made public because fewer than 11 students were tested.

| Subject: Reading/ELA | Test: <u>CST</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 4 | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 95 | 93 | 94 | 95 |
| Advanced | 82 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 81 |
| Number of students tested | 116 | 149 | 113 | 116 | 119 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| alternative assessment | _ | | | | - |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price | | | | | |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/ | | | | | |
| Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | 1 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special | | | | | |
| Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 64 | 70 | 71 | 83 |
| Advanced | 44 | 36 | 50 | 57 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 14 | 10 | 14 | 12 |
| 3. English Language Learner | | | | | 12 |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | 1 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | 1 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | | | | |
| 5. African- American | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | 1 | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | 1 | |
| Number of students tested | | | | 1 | |
| 7. American Indian or | | | | | |
| Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | 1 | |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Page 25 of 28 |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 95 | 93 | 95 | 96 |
| Advanced | 78 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 81 |
| Number of students tested | 83 | 113 | 85 | 83 | 100 |
| 10. Two or More Races | | | | | |
| identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Filipino | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California used Smarter Balance Testing in 2013 - 2014 therefore the data tables are off by one year.

Blank boxes indicates data were not made public because fewer than 11 students were tested.

| Subject: Reading/ELA | Test: <u>CST</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 5 | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 92 | 94 | 97 | 93 | 92 |
| Advanced | 61 | 69 | 73 | 60 | 60 |
| Number of students tested | 153 | 109 | 112 | 118 | 98 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with | | | | | |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| alternative assessment | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price | | | | | |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/ | | | | | |
| Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special | | | | | |
| Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 64 | 88 | 91 | 70 | |
| Advanced | 29 | 50 | 73 | 30 | |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 9 |
| 3. English Language Learner | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino | | | | | |
| Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American | | | | | |
| Students Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | 1 | | + | + |
| Advanced Number of students tested | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Proficient and above Advanced | | 1 | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or | | | | | |
| Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | 1 | | + | |
| Advanced | | 1 | | | Page 27 of 28 |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 93 | 93 | 98 | 94 | 93 |
| Advanced | 61 | 68 | 75 | 60 | 61 |
| Number of students tested | 117 | 75 | 79 | 89 | 88 |
| 10. Two or More Races | | | | | |
| identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Filipino | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California used Smarter Balance Testing in 2013 - 2014 therefore the data tables are off by one year.

Blank boxes indicates data were not made public because fewer than 11 students were tested.